

## SPECIAL ORDERS

TECHNOLOGY AND WEAPONS  
TRANSFERS TO CHINA AND THE  
SITUATION IN PANAMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to speak on an issue which I have, indeed, spoken about before, but I have some startling new information for the American people.

It is no surprise to anyone that I am deeply concerned about America's relationship with Communist China. In this body, we have votes on the trading status with Communist China, and this administration is operating under policy guidelines that deal with Communist China in a certain way.

In fact, the United States Congress, the House of Representatives, and the Senate have voted for normal trade relations, or what used to be called most-favored-nation status for China, and a majority of Members of this body on my side of the aisle have voted to treat Communist China in terms of our trade relations as we do normal trade relations with other societies; that, of course, with a large number of people on the other side supporting most-favored-nation status, normal trade relations as well.

The Clinton administration has gone beyond this. Perhaps those of us in this House believe that trading relations with another country, even a dictatorship like that on the mainland of China, will in some way help that society evolve into a more peaceful, more benevolent, more democratic situation.

I consider that to be wishful thinking. I disagree with that concept. I personally believe in free trade between free people, and it is better to give dictatorships and people who live under dictatorships the incentive to reform and the incentive to move towards democracy, rather than giving them the fruits of a positive trade relationship with this, the strongest economy in the world.

I would treat Communist China differently than I would treat the government of Belgium or Italy or other democratic societies in trying to determine what our trade policy should be.

Again, this is based on wishful thinking. However, it is beyond my realm and my ability to understand how this administration has been able to move forward with its policies toward Communist China over these last 6 years.

The President of the United States has insisted time and again that Communist China be considered a strategic partner of the United States. Those are the words that this administration has insisted upon, Communist China a strategic partner of the United States.

A few moments ago we pledged our allegiance to the flag of the United

States of America. Our flag, as I noted before we said the pledge, stands for freedom and justice. How can a country which is based not on some ethnic background, as our country has no ethnicity that we are supposedly protecting, as in other countries, their national identity stems from that, from an ethnic or racial homogeneity among the people, but we have no religious belief that binds all of our people together. In fact, we have every race and every ethnic group from every part of the world, people who have come here to America; and we have every religion in America.

What binds Americans together is our love of liberty and our love of justice and our love of freedom. That is the foundation, that is the basis of our country. How can we, if we believe that to be true, consider the world's worst human rights abuser as our strategic partner?

Yes, having a trading relationship with a dictatorship such as China is wishful thinking. It is also exploitation on the part of various business interests in the United States, business interests that, I might add, could care less about the working people in our country, often closing up factories here in order to set up factories in China, in order to sell the products that were made in China back here in the United States because we have such a low tariff on Chinese goods, although the Chinese tariff on our goods is very high.

But if we stand for freedom and justice, how can we have not just a trading relationship but a strategic partnership with Communist China?

It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that this nonsense, this almost surrealistic policy on the part of the Clinton administration, has already yielded a horrible bounty of threats and jeopardy to the United States of America.

Let me make this very clear. The Clinton policy of treating Communist China as a friend, as a benevolent country, as a strategic partner, has resulted in putting the United States in grave danger.

There are two things that I will talk about today. First, I have spoken about this before, and it is well known in the public, although it is being denied through the liberal media over and over and over again now, and that is, the weapons and technology of mass destruction that Communist China has managed to obtain because of our lax policies towards the Communist China regime; and number two, I would like to speak today about dramatic information that I have uncovered in Panama.

During a recent trip to Panama, I spent time investigating the situation, spoke to people who were in hiding, who were afraid for their lives, spoke to others who were firsthand observers of corruption and firsthand observers of a strategic maneuver on the part of the Chinese that is moving forward and putting the United States in great danger.

So I will be speaking first about the technology and missiles that have found their way and been upgraded, the Chinese missiles that have been upgraded with American technology; and then I would like to talk a little bit about what I discovered in Panama.

It is most disturbing to me, Mr. Chairman, that after 2 years we still have press reports from the likes of Bob Scheerer of the Los Angeles Times. And why the Los Angeles Times feels that it has to always tout the far left line, I do not know. I do not understand that. I do not understand how a major newspaper in the United States can continually take the side of those left-wing regimes, and downplay any threat to the United States that these left-wing regimes around the world pose to the United States of America.

But now, Mr. Scheerer in the L.A. Times and others in the media and this administration, through an orchestrated maneuvering, is trying to suggest that there was no validity to the Cox report and that the Chinese really have not, through underhanded means, obtained information that permits them to develop weapons of mass destruction that threaten millions of Americans.

This I assert today is a truism. Over the last 7 years, the Communist Chinese have been able to obtain and start putting into their weapons systems technology that cost the American people, the American taxpayer, billions of dollars to develop.

The Communist Chinese have been able to use American technology to leapfrog ahead by decades, farther ahead than what they would be if it was not for the fact that they had American technology at their disposal, which permits them to build weapons of mass destruction that threaten every American city, that threaten tens of millions of Americans with nuclear incineration. They have atomic weapons that are based on American technology, and they obtained them from the United States in some way.

Mr. Speaker, I would say today that the American people need to pay attention. I would alert the American people that something is wrong with the taxpayer dollars that they have spent by the billions which are now being put in the hands of people like those who are in charge of the regime in Beijing, the Communist Chinese regime.

There is something wrong when those billions of dollars that we spent during the Cold War now find their way, the technology that was developed finds its way to a power like Communist China. And no amount of words, it is hard to even describe the process of the mangling of the language and word games that is being played by this administration in order to call China our strategic partner; to call Communist China, the world's worst human rights abuser, our strategic partner.

□ 1015

This has resulted in several things. Number one, this body had to act on its